7		
1	Daniel Charles Privett 10316 Pinion Trail	7
2	Escondido, CA 92026	
3	Tel. (858) 602-7730 2008 AUG 28 PM 3	
4	SPUTHERN DISTRICT OF CAL	PHNA
5	ay VNA	DEPUTY
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	FRACTIONAL VILLAS, INC. ) A California corporation, )	
12 13	Plaintiff, ) CASE NO. 08-CV-1317 DMS LSP	
14	vs.	
15	JASON KATZ, an individual: ) ANSWER OF DANIEL CHARLES LENDING EXECUTIVES INC. a ) PRIVETT	
16	California corporation; YOLANDA )	
17	ORTIZ-PARRA, an individual, RAYMOND VINOLE, an individual)	
18	DANIEL CHARLES PRIVETT, an ) Individual, and DOES 1-25,	
19	<u>Defendants</u> )	
20		
21		
22		
23	DANIEL CHARLES PRIVETT admits that he is a co-owner of Legend; admits that he	
24	lives in Escondido, California; admits the jurisdictional allegations; based on insufficient	
25	information or belief, denies the remaining allegations in the complaint.	
26		
27		
28		
,	ANSWED OF DANIEL CHARLES PRIVETT	

Page 1 of 3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

## **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Plaintiff complaint has failed to state facts sufficient to state a cause of action against this
Defendant.

Page 2 of 3

- 2. Plaintiff's complaint is barred by the applicable statute of limitations.
- 3. Plaintiff's claimed works were not original and therefore the copyright is invalid.
- 4. Plaintiff's claimed violation of copyright lacked copyrightable subject matter.
- 5. Plaintiff is not the owner of the copyright to the subject material.
- 6. Plaintiff's claimed subject matter of the copyright is in the public domain.
- 7. Plaintiff's claimed copyright infringement was in fact independently created.
- 8. Defendant's use, if any, of Plaintiff's subject material was de minimis.
- 9. Defendant's use of the subject matter was fair use.
- 10. The subject material claimed by Plaintiff to be infringed by Defendant was not protectable, nor copyrightable expression.
- 11. Plaintiff's State of California cause of action is preempted by federal law.
- 12. Plaintiff's claim of copyright over the subject material is not fixed since Plaintiff did not author the subject material.
- 13. Plaintiff failed to properly or effectively disclose Plaintiff's copyright protection.
- 14. Plaintiff's claim to copyright of the subject material is a misuse of the copyright laws.
- 15. Plaintiff's claim to copyright over material which is in the public domain, or authored by others, demonstrates unclean hands and equitably bars the Plaintiff from recovery.
- 16. Defendant lacked willful intent.

Dated: August 28, 2008

DANIEL CHARLES PRIVETT

27

28

Page 3 of 3

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am an adult and not a party to the foregoing action.

I maintain offices at 7825 Fay Avenue, Suite 200, La Jolla, CA 92037.

I certify that I mailed by U.S. Mail a copy of Answer Of Daniel Charles Privett to Robert Berkowitz, Coast Law Group, LLP, attorney in charge for the plaintiff, whose address is 169 Saxony Road, Suite 204, Encinitas, CA 92024, on August 28, 2008.

Leon E. Campbell